

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasofan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/724,161	12/01/2003	Kyung-Eun Lee	46053	9389	
1609 ROYLANCE.	7590 05/26/201 ABRAMS, BERDO &	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1300 19TH STREET, N.W.			RABOVIANS	RABOVIANSKI, JIVKA A	
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		2426			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/26/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/724,161	LEE ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JIVKA RABOVIANSKI	2426		

	JIVKA RABOVIANSKI	2426					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 17 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
 All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07. Extensions of time may be oblished under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may cause the period of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may cause the period of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS 							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims.			ne issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	_				
7. \(\subseteq \text{ for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)} \) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but because of the rejection stated in the previous Office act		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
/Joseph P. Hirl/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426 May 24, 2010							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." and give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of and consistent with the written description of the invention in the application.

Specification describes a first TS demultiplexer the: "TS demultiplexer 225 separates the CAT (Conditional Access Table) packets and the PMT (Program Map Table) packets from the transport stream" [0.038], and a second demultiplexer TS demultiplexer 231 supports reproduction of various digital multimedia data other than digital broadcasting data" [0.030]; "the TS demultiplexer 231 demultiplexes the input data and separates the multiplexed and audio data" [0.043]. The disclosed references include on exhibit per stream the function of the first and the second – see Fig. 4.1e.porini separates the control word from the broadcast signal and demultiplexes the playback signal from the hard disc; and Figs. 3AZ/40 separates the control word from the program and demultiplexes programs from source anther than cable interface and 4B/Martin. Both references teach demultiplexer performing the same function as the receiver in the application. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine both demilteplexers, since it has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same function as before involves only routine skill in the art. In re Karlson, 136 USPO 1384.

In addition the multimedia module is not a part of the receiving module as is claimed. The multimedia module is connected to the decoder-module.